



## **Trans-Lake Washington Project**

Washington State  
Department of Transportation  
Sound Transit

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS FROM AUGUST 2001 TO JANUARY 2002**

### **August 2001**

**Source:** E-mail

**Date of Comment:** August 2, 2001

**Subjects:** Alternatives, mitigations/enhancements, general purpose lanes, HOV lanes, HCT, tunnel, I-90, lids, and TDM.

**Comment:** I'm all for a tunnel link from SR 520 into downtown Seattle to eliminate having to weave across five lanes of traffic to get to the Mercer Street exit. I feel that a combination of getting more people to either carpool or use mass transit AND adding HOV Lanes and General Purpose Lanes to SR 520 are the answer. Lidding parts of SR 520 similar to I-90 is also a good idea. Also, when a section of freeway is resurfaced or reconstructed it should be paved with concrete so it will last longer.

---

**Source:** E-mail

**Date of Comment:** August 29, 2001

**Subjects:** Alternatives, impacts, general purpose lanes, and early action.

**Comment:** Let's get two general purpose lanes added to the SR 520 Bridge ASAP folks. Business in this region is going to strangle (and leave or die) if you don't get off the political dime.

---

### **September 2001**

**Source:** E-mail

**Date of Comment:** September 11, 2001

**Subjects:** Public involvement.

**Comment:** Is the Trans-Lake all committee workshop on 9/19 still going to be held? I was under the impression that it had been cancelled, yet your website still shows it as being held. Please advise.

---

**Source:** Project Dialogue Center

**Date of Comment:** September 10, 2001

**Subjects:** Alternatives and general purpose lanes.

**Comment:** In today's mail she received a flyer on the Trans-Lake Washington Project. She wanted to make her desire known, that to add general purpose lanes is her priority on her list of things.

---

**Source:** Project Dialogue Center

**Date of Comment:** September 10, 2001

**Subjects:** Public involvement.

**Comment:** Hello, he received the flyer in the mail about a couple of open houses. The one in the eastside at the North Bellevue Senior Center, doesn't give the complete address, unless he is missing it here. It just says 148<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE in Bellevue. Call him at work to let him know the number on 148<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE.

---

**Source:** Project Dialogue Center

**Date of Comment:** September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001

**Subjects:** Public involvement.

**Comment:** Hi, he is calling regarding the scheduled open houses on September 25<sup>th</sup> and October 2<sup>nd</sup>. He received some information telling him that these have been cancelled and wanted to find out if this was true or not, right now it is 10:15 am, Tuesday, September 11<sup>th</sup>. He would appreciate a call back at the earliest convenience. A message can be left on extension one.

---

**Source:** Project Dialogue Center

**Date of Comment:** September 12<sup>th</sup>, 2001

**Subjects:** Public involvement, alternatives, and project.

**Comment:** He has before him the flyer for the open houses on the 25<sup>th</sup> and the 2<sup>nd</sup>. He understands that the purpose is to determine which of the alternatives will be carried forward for environmental analysis. He would like to know the deadlines for when it will be decided which of the alternatives will be taken forward, or what is the deadline for taking comments? Today is Wednesday and it would be helpful to call him back today. Thanks. Goodbye.

---

**Source:** E-mail

**Date of Comment:** September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2001

**Subjects:** Public involvement.

**Comment:** I live in Montlake and would like to attend a meeting regarding the Trans-Lake Project. I don't see any September dates on your schedule. Are all meetings complete?

---

**Source:** Project Dialogue Center

**Date of Comment:** September 21st, 2001

**Subjects:** Public involvement and project.

**Comment:** Just want to say that the decision made to postpone the Trans-Lake Washington Project open houses, is the best decision that has been made by anything that has anything to do with Sound Transit to this date, given the dismal track of Sound Transit, given the current circumstances, given the pending in the election in the fall that could make a big difference in the complexion for many projects in King County. Thinks this is an extremely wise decision and he applauds the project for this. He hopes that more contemplation and careful thought is given for any other projects similar to what it took to make this decision. Thank you.

---

**Source:** Mail

**Date of Comment:** September 26, 2001

**Subjects:** North bridge, impacts, and alternatives.

**Comment:**

September 21, 2001

Trans-Lake project mailing address

Gentlemen:

Regarding the proposed SR 520 gridlock study, I strongly suggest you re-examine a third cross-lake bridge from the north of Sand Point at about 210<sup>th</sup> Street to the Juanita area. Another SR 520 bridge addition will only make the Montlake mess worse. In addition to a third bridge, there should be an additional east-west highway from I-5 from about Alderwood Manor to Monroe.

Further, the north-south traffic should have the old Thompson Freeway plan rehabbed along with a freeway improvement on old Highway 99 from Federal Way north to Everett. Furthermore, in the future a freeway will be necessary from Highway 18 to Maple Valley, then north to Issaquah and east of Lake Sammamish to Monroe.

The latter are long-range plans for the future to avoid the mess we are now in.

Sincerely, [Signature]

---

## **October 2001**

**Source:** Mail (newsletter)

**Date of Comment:** October 18, 2001

**Subjects:** HCT, mitigations/enhancements, I-90, and alternatives.

**Comment:** Rail transit should encircle Lake Washington, with transit spurs to Redmond and Issaquah on eastside, to Bothell/Woodinville on northeast, Everett on north, Green River Valley/Federal Way on south end. Purpose is to provide access to all work centers, not just downtown Seattle. Rail transit should also have spurs on I-90 and 520 between Eastside and Seattle, but not in initial platform construction.

---

**Source:** Mail (brochure)

**Date of Comment:** October 30, 2001

**Subjects:** Public involvement.

**Comment:** What is the latest? Where can I view the latest proposals, especially since you have postponed the September meetings? Thank you.

---

## **November 2001**

**Source:** E-mail

**Date of Comment:** November 26, 2001

**Subjects:** Project and HCT.

**Comment:** I am doing a report on what the best method for mass transit in the Seattle metropolitan area is. I am hoping to receive information about different ideas for mass transit in the area. Any information would be greatly appreciated.

---

**Source:** Committee Meeting (e-mail)

**Date of Comment:** November 27, 2001

**Subjects:** Impacts, early action, and mitigations/enhancements.

**Comment:** Can you send this comment to the Executive and Advisory Committee members? If so, thanks a lot!!

Mr. Douglas MacDonald, Secretary, WSDOT, PO Box 47300, 310 Maple Park Ave  
Olympia, WA 98504-7300

Dear Mr. MacDonald:

Thank you meeting with [name] and I on September 17, 2001. To follow up, in the interest of easing traffic congestion in the Trans-Lake Study/Project area, I hope that you can pursue:

- 1) What happened to the Trans-Lake Report, dated October 1999, Early Action Item (p. 20) recommending that the Montlake Bridge stay down during peak hours between 3-7 PM weekdays? The DOT should be working hard for this relatively quick, low cost improvement to traffic flow since new construction is a long way off.
- 2) Applying plastic glare screens on the median barrier on the SR 520 Evergreen Point Bridge. They exist after SR 520 hits the land in Bellevue, but are not on the bridge. This is another relatively cheap cure for congestion as they help prevent the incidents caused by headlight glare from oncoming cars as well as the traffic slow down because of rubbernecking if an incident occurs in the other direction.
- 3) Using the electronic signs on I-5 near 45<sup>th</sup> to alert drivers that the Evergreen Point Bridge is scheduled to open for a boat/ship at a certain time – as soon as the bridge tender is alert to the need. Even if it is only 10 minutes notice (the time it takes the tender to get prepared for the opening, this would be helpful to travelers while they still have a choice of bridges).

I appreciate the enthusiasm, which you are bringing to your new position as Secretary of Transportation and look forward to your progress addressing transportation issues in our state.  
Sincerely,  
[name]

cc: Trans-Lake Executive, Technical, and Advisory Committee Members; Washington State Transportation Commission; Governor Gary Locke; John Okamoto, WSDOT; Rob Fellows, WSDOT; Les Rubstello, WSDOT; Renee Montgelas, WSDOT; King Cushman, PSRC; Seattle Mayor Paul Schell; Seattle City Attorney, Mark Sidran; SeaTran Director, Daryl Grigsby; King County Councilmember, Greg Nickels; King County Councilmember, Cynthia Sullivan; Seattle Community Council Federation, Steven Lundgren; Northeast District Council Co-Chairs, Jeanne Hale, Jim Simpkins; Senator, Pat Thibaudeau; Representative, Ed Murray; Representative, Frank Chopp; Senator, Ken Jacobsen; Representative, Jim McIntyre; Representative, Phyllis Kenney; Laurelhurst Community Club; Montlake Community Club; Ravenna Community Club; View Ridge Community Club; and Transportation Choices

---

**Source:** Committee Meeting

**Date of Comment:** November 28, 2001

**Subjects:** Impacts, alternatives, right-of-way, HOV lanes, transit, mitigations/enhancements, TDM, and general purpose lane.

**Comment:**

MONTLAKE COMMUNITY CLUB

Working together to maintain and nurture the natural environment and history of the Montlake neighborhood.

November 28, 2001

Trans-Lake Washington Project Committee Members:

Over the past year, the Montlake Community Club has reviewed the progress of the Trans-Lake Washington Project and has taken several formal positions regarding the Project's design alternatives. For your information and reference, we have attached copies of those positions. We trust the Trans-Lake Project will consider these positions as it nears its final decision on alternatives to study in the project's forthcoming environmental impact analysis. We particularly call your attention to the Community Club's resolution of September 12, 2001, and our endorsement of the Hamlin-Shelby request for the addition of the "Seattle Alternative" to your EIS alternative.

On behalf of the community club, I want to thank the TLWP team for the many hours spent briefing Montlake residents on the progress and evolution of the project designs. We hope the project will continue to be generous with its time as the design phase concludes; we trust TLWP still requires our vigorous attempts to provide input. As you know, Montlake is a community especially affected by the SR-520 highway; and while it will continue to be watchful of TLWP proposals, it shares the regional concern that "something" must be done to ease the presently severe traffic congestion on both the highway and on local Seattle streets. We plan to be active participants in the design process that follows the EIS phase.

Sincerely,  
[name and address]

Enclosures: MCC endorsement of "Seattle Alternative," 11/14/01  
MCC Resolution 9/12/01  
MCC Resolutions 6/13/01  
MCC Resolution 3/14/01

### **Motion** **(Adopted November 14, 2001)**

The Membership of the Montlake Community Club, meeting on November 14, 2001, moved to endorse the following position of the Hamlin-Shelby Residents:

The residents of the Hamlin-Shelby neighborhood recognize that the City of Seattle, including this Montlake Community, suffers from an urgent transportation crisis. We also recognize that congestion in the SR-520 Corridor is a significant piece of that crisis, and agree that measures to improve SR-520's capacity are urgently needed.

At the same time, we are convinced that these capacity improvements can be accomplished without further destruction of natural or built environments, or by relocation traffic congestion problems to other part of the City's arterial and freeway system, such as the I-5 Corridor and Northeast Pacific Street.

We therefore ask that the Trans-Lake Washington Project develop an alternative to be studied in the Project's forthcoming EIS, based on criteria stated in the 1997 City of Seattle Resolution

(Res. 29574). The elements of this alternative are listed below as “The Seattle Alternative.” We further ask that the City of Seattle vigorously support this Petition by formally requesting that this alternative be included in the Trans-Lake Washington EIS.

---

## **“THE SEATTLE ALTERNATIVE”**

- A. That the completed project be contained within the current right-of-way, which previous SR-520 project proposals have shown can easily accommodate at least six lanes of traffic, plus of-ramps, shoulders, overpass and lid structures and necessary clearances; and
- B. Enlarge the existing SR-520 freeway to no more than six lanes, two of which shall be for transit, van and carpools only; and
- C. Construct no additional ramps, especially no such ramps or freeway extensions across the Montlake Cut; and
- D. Fully mitigate or avoid SR-520’s environmental impacts, existing and proposed, on built and natural environments within Seattle; and
- E. Assume that the City of Seattle will embark on an initiative to enact Transportation Demand Management (TDM) legislation, to be adopted in conjunction with adoption of any proposals for Trans-Lake Washington capacity improvements.

PLEASE NOTE: this alternative, and all other alternatives proposed by the Trans-Lake Washington Project, must satisfy the provision of the City of Seattle Resolution, stating that, in order to be acceptable to this city, this project shall “not increase, and possibly reduce, the use of city arterials by commuter traffic.”

## **Resolutions** **(Adopted June 13, 2001)**

### **Resolution No.1**

The Montlake Community Club, in accordance with its adopted Transportation Policies, resolves that any action for expansion of SR-520 resulting in the taking of private residential property in Montlake is unacceptable to this community, and will be actively opposed by this community club.

### **Resolution No. 2**

The Montlake Community Club, in accordance with its adopted Transportation Policies, resolves that each design alternative for the expansion of SR-520, in order to be acceptable to this community, must include an inclusive and effective program for reducing reliance on single-occupant vehicle traffic by land uses served by the SR-520 corridor generally; and in particular, by land uses affecting Montlake arterials. In furtherance of this position, the MCC asks that the City of Seattle immediately develop programs to implement the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) recommendations of the Trans-Lake Washington Project.

In particular, the MCC asks that the City of Seattle immediately undertake revisions to its current land use regulations that will result in reduced reliance on single-occupant vehicle

travel; and implement programs that will establish and fund alternative forms of travel, including improved bus service, van pools and car pools.

**The Montlake Community Club further resolves that:**

1. The text of these resolutions shall be communicated to the Trans-Lake Washington project, to the City of Seattle, and to affected communities in the SR-520 corridor; and
  2. The Montlake representatives to the Trans-Lake Project take note of these resolutions, and actively promote their spirit and intent to the Trans-Lake Washington Project.
- 

## **December 2001**

**Source:** E-mail

**Date of Comment:** December 1, 2001

**Subjects:** Alternatives, transit, HOV lane, HCT, I-90, and mitigations/enhancements.

**Comment:** I am dismayed, but not surprised to read Sound Transit's biased HCT Technology Alternatives report, which ignores many of the advantages of monorail, while emphasizing trivial shortcomings. It suggests rejecting technologies that are "One Of A Kind" and places monorail in that category. This is not true: as the report states in another section, most monorails operate on Alweg size guideways. These systems are available from several vendors including Hitachi, Bombardier and Monorail Malaysia. In addition, the City of Seattle owns the blueprints for our existing monorail trains. These could no doubt be built by Boeing or another fabricator, and use standard New York City subway replacement parts. It questions whether automated systems save money since they need maintenance to ensure "high safety standards". The Vancouver Skytrain has 99+% reliability and breaks even financially. Portland's MAX system regularly kills people on the tracks and comes nowhere close to breaking even.

This report makes no mention of the benefits of elevated, automated HCT. It just makes unsupported allegations replacement parts might be more expensive, and offers random observations like "The Tokyo Monorail appears to be a demanding tire application". Who cares? No solid reasons are offered for the dismissal of monorail. I think the giveaway phrase used in the report is "compatibility with other routes". Clearly this report from Sound Transit is going to be biased in favor of light rail, since they have committed to pouring billions into Link already.

In fact, the report was prepared by Parsons Brinckerhoff. It boggles my mind how a report examining "alternatives" could possibly give fair consideration to other technologies when written by the firm responsible for the original (cost overrun plagued) light rail plan. It would hardly be in their best interest to report that monorail is cheaper, more aesthetically pleasing, and just as capable as light rail. This strikes me as a clear conflict of interest. Clearly the people of Seattle want a monorail. We have voted for it twice despite the business and media establishment warning us against it.

The region has never been given a chance to vote on monorail, because ST and regional planners have consistently ignored and dismissed it. This current report offers no reason to not consider



monorail in the EIS. Monorail has clear advantages, and I think the WSDOT should hire unbiased consultants to compare the cost of a monorail to Bellevue/Redmond versus light rail. As well as capital costs, they should consider lifecycle cost/Operations & Maintenance. The Trans-Lake project should also coordinate with the ETC on connecting a future cross-lake monorail with the proposed Ballard-West Seattle line.

I would like to see the I-90 reversible lanes converted to two-way bus operation, and monorail added along SR 520. Monorail could run in the freeway median to Redmond, providing fast, reliable transit to the Eastside, without the costs of light rail or building a wider roadway. It could ride atop the traffic lanes on the bridge deck, supported by arches/noise walls. I also support adding HOV lanes, but no GP lanes. I also support adding a ramp to the Express Lanes. This should be HOV only, implemented along with a contra flow HOV lane from Northgate to Downtown in the Express Lanes.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. [name]

---

**Source:** E-mail

**Date of Comment:** December 1, 2001

**Subjects:** Public involvement, I-90, bicycle/pedestrian facilities, and alternatives.

**Comment:** THANKS for putting so much information on this project on the web! I think it's TERRIFIC that you folks are willing to allocate resources toward keeping the public (me!) informed on the SR 520 expansion project. I especially like the little schematics that show what lanes will be for each of the different alternatives.

I've certainly got my preference re. which alternative I'd like to see implemented. . . But whatever alternative you select. . .I'm sure looking forward to being able to bike across Lake Washington without having to go all the way south to I-90!

---

**Source:** E-mail

**Date of Comment:** December 3, 2001

**Subjects:** Public involvement.

**Comment:** Hi Trans-Lake Folks,  
Could you please tell us the name of whom we should direct our official comments to and that person's address, email and fax number? The Northeast District Council has comments to submit and we need to know to whom to direct them. Thanks a heap. Please respond soon.

---

**Source:** E-mail

**Date of Comment:** December 6, 2001

**Subjects:** Alternatives, impacts, mitigations/enhancements, transit, HCT, HOV lanes, right-of-way, entrance lanes, and TDM.

**Comment:** Trans-Lake Comments from NEDC--One More Time

Dear Mayor Schell, Council President Pageler, Members of the Seattle City Council and the Trans-Lake Committee,

I apologize for resending this, but I was on the phone when I was sending the last message, got distracted and forgot to include the Hamlin-Shelby Resident Petition that accompanies our letter. Attached and pasted below are our comments including the petition. We also faxed this to you.

Thank you for considering our views.

[name]

December 6, 2001

Mayor Paul Schell and Members of the Seattle City Council  
Municipal Building  
600 Fourth Avenue  
Seattle, Washington 98104-1876 Fax 684-5360 / 684-8587

Trans-Lake Washington Project  
401 Second Avenue South, #300  
Seattle, Washington 98104 Fax 464-6084

RE: Trans-Lake Washington Project

Dear Mayor Schell, Members of the City Council and the Members of the Trans-Lake Washington Study Committee:

Enclosed please find copy of a petition from the Montlake Hamlin-Shelby Residents regarding the Trans-Lake Washington Project. The petition calls for inclusion of a review of what the authors call the "Seattle Alternative" in the Environmental Impact Statement. At its meeting of November 1, 2001 the Northeast District Council examined and discussed this petition including the "Seattle Alternative." We found that the petition is consistent with and encompassed by all previous NEDC positions on the Trans-Lake Washington Project and substantially consistent with the resolution adopted by the Seattle City Council calling for no expansion of SR 520 other than possibly for transit purposes. Accordingly a motion to endorse this petition was adopted unanimously by the Council with two abstentions.

We are concerned that alternatives proposed for study in the Environmental Impact Statement should substantially comply with City of Seattle Resolution 29574. Some alternatives under consideration call for the addition of general purpose lanes to SR 520, something rejected by the City's resolution. Given the fundamental realities that underlay the adoption of that resolution and persist to this today, the basic conclusion is that the streets of Seattle cannot absorb more single-occupancy vehicles.

We urge you to act in conformity with the attached petition. Thank you for considering the views of the Northeast District Council. Please keep us informed at the Trans-Lake Project moves forward.

Sincerely,

[name]

cc: Senators Pat Thibeaudeau and Ken Jacobsen; Speaker Frank Chopp and Representatives Ed Murray, Jim McIntire and Phyllis Kenney

## PETITION

of the Montlake Hamlin-Shelby Residents regarding the Trans-Lake Washington Study

To the Trans-Lake Washington Project and the Mayor and City Council of the City of Seattle:

The residents of the Hamlin-Shelby neighborhood recognize that the City of Seattle, including this Montlake Community, suffers from an urgent transportation crisis. We also recognize that congestion in the SR-520 Corridor is a significant piece of that crisis, and agree that measures to improve SR-520's capacity are urgently needed.

At the same time, we are convinced that these capacity improvements can be accomplished without further destruction of natural or built environments, or by relocating traffic congestions problems to other parts of the City's arterial and freeway system, such as the I-5 Corridor and Northeast Pacific Street.

We therefore ask that the Trans-Lake Washington Project develop an alternative to be studied in the Project's forthcoming EIS, based on criteria stated in the 1997 City of Seattle Resolution (Res. 29574). The elements of this alternative are listed below as "The Seattle Alternative." We further ask that the City of Seattle vigorously support this Petition by formally requesting that this alternative be included in the Trans-Lake Washington EIS.

### **"THE SEATTLE ALTERNATIVE"**

- a. That the completed project be contained within the current right-of-way, which previous SR-520 project proposals have shown can easily accommodate at least six lanes of traffic, plus off-ramps, shoulders, overpass and lid structures and necessary clearances; and
  - b. Enlarge the existing SR-520 freeway to no more than six lanes, two of which shall be for transit, van and carpools only; and
  - c. Construct no additional ramps, especially no such ramps or freeway extensions across the Montlake Cut; and
  - d. Fully mitigate or avoid SR-520's environmental impacts, existing and proposed, on built and natural environments within Seattle; and
  - e. Assume that the City of Seattle will embark on an initiative to enact Transportation Demand Management (TDM) legislation, to be adopted in conjunction with adoption of any proposals for Trans-Lake Washington capacity improvements.
- 

**Source:**

E-mail

**Date of Comment:** December 7, 2001

**Subjects:** Public involvement and transit.

**Comment:** RE: Directions to MOHAI

Bus routes - Only 1 route is listed from downtown, but MOHAI can be accessed from ANY SR-520 bound bus (255, 256, 258, 262, etc.). Please update your directions page to help promote transit usage.

---

**Source:** E-mail

**Date of Comment:** December 10, 2001

**Subjects:** Impacts, transit, bicycle/pedestrian facilities, and transit.

**Comment:** Why are we spending tones of cash on this when presented with the clear facts:

- 1) More lanes will only encourage more cars. (Call the federal department of roads and safety if you don't believe the statistics --my uncle works there and when he visited he said it would be a grave mistake to expand the bridge.)
- 2) More lanes encourage more people to live/shop/work on the opposite side of the lake
- 3) The world petroleum out put is projected to peak in 2004. Shouldn't we be discouraging cars?
- 4) It would cost very little to have an experimental month in which bus service was quadrupled, one lane was closed to cars (in much of downtown too) and the buses were free.
- 5) It is probably cheaper to quadruple the bus service and make them free than to build and repair the bridge.
- 6) More cars clog the streets that buses and bikes use.
- 7) Cars kill annually almost ten times the number of people who died in the twin towers.. talk about a public terror.

Do the math: calculate the amount we spend per driver on road repairs and police, EMTs, and unpaid Harberview visits. -- all because of the cars, then add on the per driver cost of the bridge. If buses were free, There would be much less time in loading and unloading and if buses had lanes to themselves then the trip would happen faster and the bus and driver could carry more passengers/hour to where they want to go.

Note that we still haven't calculated in the social costs of the children who have to stay inside because the streets are not safe for bikes or playing ball -- too many people driving on side streets to get around the clogs.

-- nor the economic costs of our citizens spending all it's money on imported cars and gas -- instead of paying local employees to drive and maintain buses.

-- nor the fact that once one bottleneck is cleared -- the cars will jam up some place else.

-- nor the fact that the noise from the SR 520 is deafening and has destroyed the tranquility of the Arboretum water trail.

My question is: When will the insanity end?

---

**Source:** E-mail

**Date of Comment:** December 18, 2001

**Subjects:** HOV lane, bicycle/pedestrian facilities, general purpose lanes, impacts, transit, I-90, and TDM.

**Comment:**

Hi Jennifer, I would like to comment on the Trans-Lake Washington Project. Many of the options include a high occupancy vehicle lane. In theory this is a good idea, but in reality it does not work! People don't use those lanes and don't plan their commutes to use them. Why don't we stop living in a fantasy world and address the issues in reality?? We need to open all those lanes up to all vehicles or at the least restrict them for only a few hours during the heavy morning and evening commute times. Spending taxpayer money to add yet another unused lane is inane!

In addition, we need to:

- \*encourage companies to stagger their work start times,
- \*add VanPools, and
- \*encourage the use of buses (that is another transit solution that has not caught on to enough commuters),
- \*encourage companies to have employees work virtual office from home and,
- \*work alternate work weeks (other than M-F 8-5).

My vote is to add one or more general purpose lanes to SR 520, add bicycle/pedestrian facilities and add general purpose lanes to I-90. Please pass this on to anyone who is interested in a Kirkland resident and I-405 and SR 520 commuter opinion.

Thank you, [name]

---

**Public comments up until January 24, 2002 (excluding open house comments)**

**Source:** E-mail

**Date of Comment:** January 7, 2002

**Subjects:** Mitigation/enhancements, I-90, tolls/taxes, and project.

**Comment:** Comments: Two simple points:

1) One rating that caught my eye was the safety rating.... High speed traffic should be the most dangerous. I can't imagine getting terribly hurt driving the 25 -45 mph on the 520. I am terrified on the I-90 where people swerve in and out of lanes at 80+ mph.

2) The predictions are for endless growth in Seattle. I see no indication that the economy will continue to grow at the pace of the 90's. Let's face it. It is only a matter of time before people realize that the east side gets 20% more rain than Seattle proper...-- and is a few degrees cooler in the winter. People will telecommute from north of Bainbridge -- where it is dryer and warmer. I must add that we are on the verge of increasing the gas tax.

Perhaps the easiest way to convince people to live near where they work is to make long distance commuting a pain in the ass.

---

**Source:** Project Dialogue Center

**Date of Comment:** January 10, 2002

**Subjects:** HOV, alternative lane, impacts and general purpose lane.

**Comment:** This is a comment to pass along to the project managers.

The main thing that he is concerned with is that if anything were done that would be great, but be sure to add general purpose lanes. Just widening the freeway by putting HOV lanes would be just like building another I-405 in Renton, which is great that something is being done now, but this is a proven failure. He has yet in his lifetime to see general purpose lanes built, which is why they are having the problems today. HOV lanes are great and are the political thing to do and all that, but we need enough lanes for everyone else. This is why traffic is such a problem now while people are beating around the bush. The HOV lane in Renton is a problem. Putting an HOV and general purpose lane is a compromise for the majority of people that travel the freeway everyday that have been neglected for years and needs to be addressed. If you don't build general purpose lanes it will be like I-405 in Renton, a proven failure. Please pass this along. There is a majority of people out there that feel the same way. Thank you for the time.

---

**Source:** Project Dialogue Center

**Date of Comment:** January 10, 2002

**Subjects:** Transit and ferries.

**Comment:** Have you given up the idea that people could get across the lake by boats? There could be passenger-only boats and scout type buses? Are you apparently ignoring this subject all together?

---

**Source:** E-mail

**Date of Comment:** January 17, 2002

**Subjects:** Alternatives, impacts, HOV lanes, pedestrian/bikes, interchanges and I-90.

**Comment:** There is a great need for a bike/pedestrian lane across SR-520. A 20 mile bike ride (e.g. the Burke or I-90) suddenly becomes ~5 and is a lot more attractive for potential bicycle commuters.

Also, HOV lanes should be on the left, like they are everywhere else in the world to avoid bogging down traffic at on-ramps, off-ramps and interchanges. This could do a surprising amount to ease congestion at these points as well as ease frustration of HOV drivers stuck behind people trying to merge at the last minute or later.

At a minimum, option 3 of the Proposed Multi-Modal Alternatives (as of April 25, 2001) should be implemented. Options 7 and 5, in that order, should also be considered as money permits.

---

**Source:** Project Dialogue Center

**Date of Comment:** January 18, 2002

**Subjects:** Impacts, mitigation/enhancement, and project.

**Comment:** She is an Eastlake resident. She will also send her comments to the project e-mail. Opposes any expansion of vehicular traffic on SR 520 and any attempt to add lanes that otherwise would impact I-5 or the junction in the Eastlake neighborhood. It is already too narrow, noisy and secluded. Developments will have to find other areas of growth and not count on the easy solution of destroying a neighborhood that is already heavily impacted. Thank you.

---

**Source:** E-mail

**Date of Comment:** January 22, 2002

**Subjects:** HOV lane, transit, ferry and alternatives.

**Comments:** I'd like to see at a minimum a 2-person HOV lane added to SR520. An increase in public transportation across the lake would help, as well as express service from North Seattle/Shoreline/LFP across the lake.

---

**Source:** E-mail

**Date of Comment:** January 22, 2002

**Subjects:** HCT and I-90.

**Comments:** Replace SR520 with a real bridge and add the light-rail or monorail lane there. There appears to be little at I-90 on the eastside that would draw train traffic (not many places one would commute to) while MS and others are a big draw in Bellevue/Redmond.

---

**Source:** Project Dialogue Center

**Date of Comment:** January 23, 2002

**Subjects:** Impacts, public involvement, general purpose lane, and HOV lane.

**Comments:** He is a resident of Seattle. He commutes across Lake Washington almost every weekday and takes the 520 bridge. Basically any additional lanes, should be HOV lanes. He thinks that HOV lanes are much more efficient than regular traffic lanes. Regular traffic lanes would almost immediately fill up and then we would be back to where we started. HOV lanes have the ability to actually significantly reduce congestion and the problems we are dealing with. My understanding that the end of the comment period is today and that he only just found out

about the comment period today, which is why he is calling. Seems like it would be great if there was more publicity for the project and there was some better way to get the word out about the comment period ending. Not necessary to call back.

---

**Source:** Project Dialogue Center

**Date of Comment:** January 23, 2002

**Subjects:** Public involvement and bike/pedestrian lane.

**Comments:** He would like someone to call him back to let him know what bicycle/pedestrian facilities the project is looking at.

---

**Source:** Project Dialogue Center

**Date of Comment:** January 23, 2002

**Subjects:** Impacts, public involvement, HCT, transit and I-90.

**Comments:** Hi, she is trying to find out if there is still a deadline today for providing feedback. She will send an e-mail comment also. The phone system dates seem to be outdated, she realizes that the last open house is on the 17<sup>th</sup>. Residents and citizens on the eastside haven't had a lot of exposure to what is being proposed for study. Would like to say if this is the only chance for input, that safety and preservation improvements should be added on SR 520 and that I-90 is used as it was originally designed to provide HCT or rapid transit across the lake. She doesn't think that anything will be gained by making changes on SR 520. In fact, most traffic on SR 520 is generated by people that work in the Microsoft area and at Microsoft and live in Seattle. She is more concerned about what happens to I-405 and SR 520 corridors trying to accommodate, when they were never intended to provide the service that they are trying to provide. A lot of money was put into I-90 and that is where efforts should be continued. This would have huge impacts on eastside residents and there would be huge revenue going across the lake, with the King County [coffers]. Would be pushing the last straw here on the camel's back. Thinks should stick with plans for HCT I-90 improvements to handle the capacity and safety and preservation improvements on SR 520; and leave everything as is, rather than accommodating automobile traffic capacity. At this point people will come up with ideas from where they choose to live from different areas where they work. The project would be enabling them to not carpool and use transit or rapid transit.

---